



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 October 2021 by A Coombes

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/21/3278647

Site Address 1 Water Board Cottages, Mora Road, London NW2 6PT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Dr Amir Hussain Avini against the decision of the London Borough of Brent Council.
 - The application Ref 21/1319, dated 11 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing garage and erection of a two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matter

3. On 20 July 2021 the Government published a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). I have had regard to this as a material consideration however, planning decisions must still be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The main parties were provided an opportunity to comment on the updated Framework and no responses were received.

Main Issues

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling with a front gable feature. It is located within a mixed area, containing residential buildings as well as a church and school, which are of varying character and age. The application seeks permission for the demolition of the existing garage and the erection of a two-storey side extension, which would meet the existing rear façade.
6. Due to the properties on Alan Coren close being set back from Mora Road, the appeal site occupies a prominent position, and the side elevation is highly

visible from the street scene. The proposed development would bring this elevation close to the boundary and introduce a flat roof and blank façade at first-floor level. Due to its siting and size, the additional bulk would be excessive and would appear dominant to the original dwelling. The long flat roof would not respect the character of the host property and the blank façade at first-floor level would be a discordant addition to the street scene. Therefore, the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

7. The proposed two-storey side element of the extension has been designed to match the approved and implemented extension at the adjoining property. However, on the site visit it was observed that this extension is not as deep as the one proposed and the appeal site already has a footprint which extends beyond the neighbouring property. Furthermore, due to its enclosed siting, the extension on 2 Water Board Cottages is less visible than the proposed extension would be. Therefore, whilst the proposed development would restore symmetry across the front facade of the two properties, this would not outweigh the harm that has been found from the rear element.
8. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would not comply with Policy DMP1 of the London Borough of Brent Local Plan, Development Management Policies, adopted 2016. Policy DMP1 ensures that new development complements the locality with regard to siting, scale, and density.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. The proposal would not accord with the Development Plan when it is considered as a whole. For the reasons given above, I recommend the appeal should be dismissed.

A Coombes

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR